



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

from the same civilization and rest upon a common historical basis. The results due to a disregard of this principle are seen when one attempts to compare antique with modern democracy, the absolutism of Roman emperors with that of monarchs of the present time, or the federal states of to day with those of ancient Greece. Coming more directly to the application of the historical method to the study of political types, the author's discussion centers around the necessity of distinguishing between the change of an institution into an entirely different thing and its modification, wherein it alters its form and some of its attributes, but still performs essentially the same political functions. In the former case the historical connection is, so to speak, purely an external one, and an attempt to analyze the character or interpret the functions of the later institution by the character and functions of the earlier is inappropriate and misleading. Thus, also, the study of institutions that have gone out of existence is of little or no practical value in the analysis of present political phenomena. Thus, without at all denying the intrinsic value of historical research, the author points out that in any attempt to analyze modern political types, the history of the past is valuable only in so far as it traces the development and thus serves to explain the nature of existing institutions. All else belongs to the domain of historical and political antiquities.

In the foregoing, the reviewer has limited himself to a notice simply of a single point. In justice to the author it should be said, however, that the work as a whole furnishes an excellent propædæutic to the study of the modern state, and the larger work of which it is a part must serve still further to enhance the already high reputation of its author. That the French rendering of the German original is well done is sufficiently attested by the name of the translator.

W. W. WILLOUGHBY.

The Development of European Polity. By HENRY SIDGWICK, late Professor at Cambridge. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1903. Pp. xxvi, 454.)

THIS book is the posthumous publication of the late Professor Sidgwick's lectures at Cambridge in the field of political science, and the place the work occupied in the author's mind is best stated in the words of the editor, Mrs. Sidgwick. He considered, she says,

That a threefold treatment of politics is desirable for completeness:—first, an exposition analytical and deductive, such as he attempted in his work on the *Elements of Politics*; secondly, an evolutionary study of the development of polity within the historic period in Europe, beginning with the earliest known Græco-Roman and Teutonic polity, and carried down to the modern state of Europe and its colonies as the last result of political evolution; thirdly, a comparative study of . . . what may be called the constitution-making century which has just ended. The

present book is an attempt at a treatment of political science from the second point of view.

To this may be added Sidgwick's own statement on pages 3-4 :

What I shall mainly attempt is to exhibit with their distinctive characteristics, to classify according to their most important resemblances, and to link together by the conception of continuous development, the principal forms of political society which the history of European civilisation manifests ; regarding them as stages in the historic process through which political society has passed, and of which the modern state, as we know it, is the outcome.

The book has not had the benefit of the author's final revision or even arrangement. It is proper to keep this in mind with respect both to defects in construction, and to features in the field of reference and bibliography that may not seem quite abreast with present-day requirements ; though when we find Robertson's *Charles the Fifth* cited for the views of Montesquieu, it may be suspected that the author had rather an old-fashioned view of his obligations in regard to sources. The book in general leaves the impression that he shared in the ordinary English inattention to the modern monograph (especially German), and was content for most of his historical information with the older general English writers. It is not to be inferred, however, that the stickler for cautious and accurate statement of historical facts will be frequently shocked ; on the whole he will perhaps be agreeably surprised, even though he may wish that it were not so positively declared that William the Conqueror scattered the lands of his followers of malice prepense, and though he may not be disposed to accept the strong statement of the close connection between the American and the French Revolutions.

After an introduction of eighty pages on governmental origins, about 100 pages are given to ancient history and 150 to the medieval period, leaving 125 for modern history. The work is unevenly done ; the whole modern part is sketchy, and while the medieval city structure is fully presented, medieval representative institutions are not. The diction is clear and forcible, and the analyses and descriptions are everywhere brought into close connection with historical fact. It bears the mark of the clear thinking, sound scholarship, and power of popularizing in the best sense that is associated with the already somewhat old-fashioned English school of which Seeley and Sidgwick were such good representatives. It is interesting to find that these two men were closely associated in their work at Cambridge ; the reader will be frequently reminded here of Seeley's ideas, especially in the part in which Sidgwick deals with modern English political development. It will be remembered that Seeley's *Introduction to Political Science* was also published posthumously and was prepared for publication by Sidgwick. This intellectual association must have been an attractive and stimulating one, and there is probably no propriety in ascribing to either one of the men an indisputably leading place.

The student of history who is occupied primarily with the state will

find much in this volume of suggestive interest. Particularly so are the passages in which Professor Sidgwick states his views of the respective scope of history and political science and of the relations between them. He discriminates between political philosophy, political science, and political history, but his reader will suspect that his discrimination is rather as to "points of view" (a term which he himself uses, p. 2) than with respect to clearly-defined and mutually exclusive fields of work. He rejects the idea "that the historical method is the one to be primarily used in attempting to find reasoned solutions of the problems of practical politics" (p. 4), and evidently would sympathize but little with the idea of a science of history. But perhaps some of those who would not quarrel with him for that might wish some changes of term in the following sentence (p. 141) in which he states most pointedly the differences he recognizes between history and political science:

The difference, generally speaking, between the scientific and the merely historical treatment of the forms of government and of political society which history presents to us, is that in history proper we are concerned primarily with particular facts, and only secondarily with general laws and types, causes and tendencies; whereas in Political Science we are concerned primarily with the general laws and types, and only with any particular fact as a part of the evidence from which our general conclusions are drawn.

VICTOR COFFIN.

The Evolution of Modern Liberty. By GEORGE L. SCHERGER, Ph.D. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Pp. xiv, 284.)

THIS volume, the preface informs us, was originally intended by the author to be a study in the relation between the American and the French bills of rights. While at work on this task; Professor Jellinek's book, *Die Erklärung der Menschen- und Bürgerrechte* appeared, and Dr. Scherger widened the scope of his treatise to include a history of the evolution of modern liberty. In the first two parts of the book the author traces the development of the doctrines of natural law and popular sovereignty from antiquity to the French Revolution; in part III he discusses the American bills of rights; in part IV, the French Declaration; and the volume closes with a chapter on the effects of formal declarations of rights.

The first half of the volume is far from satisfactory. It is a difficult task to condense the history of liberty from the earliest to modern times into a small compass, and the author has not been successful in the attempt. He presents a careful and accurate digest of the opinions of a series of eminent political philosophers, but does not give anything like an adequate description of the great march of events leading up to what we call "modern liberty". Even the evolution of the theory of liberty, viewed as *Dogmengeschichte*, he has not clearly unfolded, while the conditions that make liberty possible and the specific political forms that